DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 182 HE 012 582

AUTHOR Guyotte, Roland L.
TITLE Liberal Education and the American Dream, 1920-1950: Educators' Responses to Changing Times.
PUB DATE 7 Mar 80
NOTE 21p.
AVAILABLE FROM Paper prepared for the Missouri Valley History Conference (Omaha, NE, March 7, 1980)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Education; *Access to Education; *College Curriculum; Educational Change; *Educational History; Educational Policy; Enrollment Trends; *General Education; *Higher Education; *Liberal Arts; Public Policy; Social Change; United States History
IDENTIFIERS *Elitism

ABSTRACT

Changes between 1920 and 1950 in the American idea of going to college, from an aspiration into a right, are described. The interplay among educational leaders during this period illuminates many of their uncertainties and concerns. One element in the debate is the centrality of liberal education as a normative concept to explain and prescribe for steady growth. Debaters are consistently divided on the appropriate boundaries to ascribe to liberal education. The liberal education defended in the 1920's was education for leadership in a stratified society. The apparent inability of institutions to fulfill this mission, especially with rising enrollment, and an apparent revolution in student morals and manners were criticized. The depression era marked a silent shift away from elite higher education toward a general education model oriented to citizens and masses. It specifically called for education for following as well as leading. The world crisis leading to the second world war stimulated a revival of the humanities in the curriculum. Events and constituencies outside education influenced the growth of mass education in the 1940's, especially the GI Bill. Work at Harvard (the Harvard Redbook) promoted a significant revival of the liberal arts ideal, and the report of a presidential commission during the Truman administration was also a milestone. When mass higher education triumphed by the mid 1950's, some educators abandoned their earlier enthusiasm. During these decades the educational system enlarged and transformed itself in directions far different from the enduring liberal education goals. Although the goals were retained, the content and even purpose of liberal education remained vague. (MSE)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

APR 16 1980

ED187182

# LIBERAL EDUCATION AND THE AMERICAN DREAM, 1920-1950: EDUCATORS' RESPONSES TO CHANGING TIMES

Roland L. Guyotte

Division of Social Sciences
University of Minnesota, Morris

Missouri Valley History Conference
Omaha, Nebraska
March 7, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Roland Guyotte

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 012 582

NOT FOR REPRODUCTION OR QUOTATION
WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR

Between 1920 and 1950 the idea of going to college in America grew from an aspiration to a right. Larger numbers of students, reflecting more diverse sectors of American society than before, entered and graduated from a variety of institutions of higher learning. Enrollment grew from 600,000 in 1919 to 2.3 million in 1950. This process accompanied the enlargement of business, government, labor, the professions and other institutions in many areas of American life. Public spokesmen and private citizens alike encouraged college-going or accepted it as a public necessity with increasing frequency during this thirty-year period which culminated in a series of recommendations by national commissions in the 1940s that higher education be extended to every citizen who could possibly profit by it.[1]

For all its significance, the expansion of higher education in America was largely unplanned. No central authority during these years sought to prepare or impose guidelines or even articulate theories about the role of mass higher education. Only in the late 1940s came systematic recommendations about extending college opportunities, and these met spirited debate from opponents and skeptics. Many academic leaders and public figures struggled with the notion of mass education, consistently fearful about dilution of quality or about the inability of American society to absorb large numbers of college graduates.

The interplay among educational leaders during this period illuminates many of their uncertainties and concerns. One of the most interesting elements in the debates among educators is the remarkable centrality they attached to "liberal education" as a normative concept to explain and prescribe for the steady growth around them. A benchmark or standard which few colleges really met and which many institutions did not really aspire to, a commitment to "liberal education" uniquely distinguished American higher

education from the experiences of other nations during these years. Widespread public enthusiasm for the idea of "going to college" to "get a liberal education" found reflection in educational controversies. These debates concentrated on defining a liberal education (what to teach), enumerating an appropriate clientele (who to teach), and agreeing on ways of communicating liberal values (how to teach). Rarely did educators question the importance of liberal education itself, even though they often disagreed about important particulars.

This paper aims to survey the debates about the place of liberal education in American life from the period following World War I to the years after the Second World War. One warning is in order at the outset. Like liberty and equality, liberal education has had for Americans large, vague meanings that can obscure as often as clarify. Sometimes this terminological vagueness is part of the liberal education ideal itself. At times the concept of liberal education simply exists for its own sake, to thereby justify whatever professors and students are doing at any given moment. Like the Intelligence Quotient--which is defined as what the I.Q. tests measure--a liberal education is defined as what happens at a liberal arts college. But we can still learn a good deal about academic self-image by examining ideas about liberal education. If the liberal arts college is, as Burton Clark has called it, "the romantic ideal of American higher education," then public controversies about liberal education illuminate educators' attempts to put their best foot forward.[2]

During the years covered by this study, we may take liberal education as meaning a reasonably rigorous academic approach to the study of discrete fields of learning, coupled with a commitment to encourage in students civic virtues of initiative, community-mindedness, and love of justice. What

consistently divided educators was a definition of the appropriate boundaries and clientele for liberal education. All defended the importance of a liberal education ideal as a civilizing force in the national life. But how many Americans could actually be uplifted by it? Weren't college alumni a poor testimony to the effects of past efforts at liberal education? Did courses in current events supply an adequate perspective on the modern world, or must one study history? Was a knowledge of American social patterns a substitute for acquaintance with diverse cultures? Could the classics, or classical philosophy studied in translation, serve the society during the Great Depression? Could liberal education create a national culture for Americans or serve as a method for the resolution of philosophic and political differences? All of these questions, among others, arose as liberal educators spoke to each other and to outside publics.[3]

The academic cast of characters who participated in these discussions about the role of liberal education in American life between 1920 and 1950 included a diverse collection of college presidents, articulate faculty, aspiring entrepreneurs and a quota of disenchanted critics and malcontents. In many instances educational leaders were parochial, speaking only to each other, or public relations specialists, saying little in large terms. The official spokesmen were invariably white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant males who divided most often on the basis of identification with either public or private higher education, or by region, eastern or middle-western. In most instances easterners advocated private liberal education, while mid-westerners were associated with public institutions in which they either attempted to loosen the standards of liberal education or self-consciously imported programs from the private colleges to their institutions.

The controversies of the 1920s and the 1930s each supplied most of

the questions that concerned liberal educators during the entire period. The 1940s witnessed attempts at a reconciliation of ideas articulated earlier. In the years immediately following World War I, discussions of liberal education centered on the social objective of producing a skilled and cultivated "leadership" class sufficient to confront the problems of an industrial society. During the Depression Decade, educators turned to the liberal and general education for "citizenship" of individuals destined for the middle classes rather than the top rungs of the social ladder. World War II brought a more general national commitment to the democratization of both opportunities and rewards. Educators responded by advocating a synthetic liberal education adequate for both leaders and led, suggesting a public imperative to provide for both through mass higher education.

Higher education emerged from World War I with its reputation enhanced. Colleges and universities had speedily put their services at the disposal of the federal government. "War Issues" courses at many institutions had proved that curricula could be relevant and responsive. College students, more than young people in other segments of American society, had more eagerly supported the war effort with its presumably idealistic mission to make the world safe for democracy. Many male college students had also become an almost instant officer corps in the rapidly assembled American Expeditionary Force. Young men who found out in the army that the way to become an officer was to be a college man testified that this discovery moved them to seek higher education at the close of hostilities. For the moment, few individuals criticized universities for clamping down on dissent or for uncritical support for the federal government's wartime policies. In 1919, Harvard College President A. Lawrence Lowell blandly titled an article, "The University--the Bulwark of Civilization," and expected little criticism.[4]

The liberal education college and university presidents defended in the 1920s was education for leadership. College presidents expected their graduates to occupy high positions in a stratified society. They aimed to improve the academic training social elites received. A number of efforts which emerged during the decade promoted liberal education for a limited clientele. Frank Aydelotte at Swarthmore inaugurated an honors program to encourage greater student independence. The Rhodes Scholarships won a good deal of public comment and reminded Americans of the value of the Oxford model of liberal education. President Lowell at Harvard frequently urged a raising of academic standards. Many institutions developed special "initiatory" programs for freshmen to underscore the difference between high school and college. The distinction between the high school graduate and the "college-bred" temporarily marked the difference between leader and follower.[5]

During the 1920s, criticism of higher education increased. Most of it emphasized the apparent inability of colleges and universities to live up to their liberal education promises, especially as enrollments mushroomed. Few critics questioned the ideal itself. Thorstein Veblen's plea in The Higher Learning in America (1918) for aid to disinterested academic research rather than a concentration on teaching found echoes among faculties seeking additional funding, but few supporters outside the academy. Veblen's scorn for the machinations of college presidents and the philistinism of businessmen trustees drew more attention, but failed to address the objectives of education for leadership per se. Even the academic reforms instituted at Amherst College by Alexander Meiklejohn, soon to be a hero of liberals, did not differ in their basic assumptions from the liberal training advocated by the conservative President Lowell of Harvard. Meiklejohn shortly became lionized for his courage when fired by the Amherst trustees in 1923, but remained a firm

supporter of liberal education ideals during his entire lifetime. Meiklejohn subsequently stressed the accessibility of rigorous liberal education for ordinary students, but he did not otherwise question liberal education values.[6]

Much more commentary in the 1920s denounced the apparent revolution in morals and manners that signalled the rise of an adolescent youth culture among middle-class college students. Although the sources of that youth culture certainly predated the era of the raccoon coat and rumble seat of the 1920s, images of collegiate life became nationalized and co-educational during that decade. While increased college going among women, Catholics, and Southerners belied a single stereotype of the college student, each of these groups in turn blended into the national picture. The anti-intellectualism of students worried educational reformers, even as their antics bemused journalists. A sizeable literature questioned whether higher education was offering, as one dean put it, "college or kindergarten." A number asked "who should go to college?" and in the 1920s often answered by suggesting that too many already were enrolled who did not belong there. Too many students either seemed uninterested or incapable of living up to an ideal of high intellectual competence and commitment to leadership and service.[7]

Some colleges, especially private institutions seeking a competitive ranking in a new national setting, responded to the collegiate culture of the 1920s by limiting enrollments. In a seller's market, they repudiated for the first time LeBaron Russell Briggs's maxim that "the small colleges are always proclaiming the advantages of smallness in order to become larger." They restricted admissions to those who scored high on entrance examinations or secured favorable recommendations from high school principals, alumni of the college, or traveling admissions counselors. Selective admissions reinforced

educators' calls for academic excellence, although they rewarded middle-class students and those from outstanding secondary school backgrounds at the expense of others. In several instances, the selective admissions policies discriminated against Jewish students, often quite intentionally in the name of national "balance." These episodes revealed educators to have strong social as well as intellectual conceptions of the proper clientele for liberal education and "leadership." The new admissions policies did little to increase the accessibility of elite colleges and universities to "hidden talent" during the decade, in spite of the professed intention of their advocates. The beginnings of a "meritocracy" on campus in the 1920s rewarded the sons and daughters of those who had attended college a generation earlier under prior "open admissions" policies which discriminated mainly on ability to pay tuition.[8]

A second response to the educational problems of the 1920s occurred both at private institutions which restricted admissions and at public universities which usually could not do so. Educational reformers attempted to alter the environment of college life, both in the curriculum and in extra-curricular life in ways consistent with the liberal education ideal. In addition to "initiatory" courses for freshmen and honors courses for outstanding students, many colleges began programs of survey courses or courses related to specific social or cultural "problems." At the same time, those institutions which had the financial wherewithal built dormitories to house undergraduates and employed counselors, placement officers, and a new array of deans to oversee student life. A whole new profession, later named student-personnel administration, dates from this decade's attempt to assimilate greater numbers to the leadership objectives of the liberal education ideal. Many of the reforms were justified explicitly as attempts to recapture

in a larger, secular setting the perceived advantages of small, old-time liberal arts colleges.[9]

Frequently, observers termed the experiments of the 1920s failures. The collegiate youth culture flourished in spite of the efforts of reformers. Students at elite colleges seemed to have similar mores to those of students at less selective institutions. Academic achievement and social responsibility did not increase to the degree reformers advocated. Critics found mediocrity and philistinism rampant among alumni from famous as well as obscure colleges. Many faculty resisted administrative reforms which altered instruction in individual academic fields. The most dramatic innovations, such as the integrated-studies curriculum at the University of Wisconsin under Alexander Meiklejohn, the work-study program at Antioch, and the intensive teaching promised by Hamilton Holt at Rollins either fell by the wayside or remained isolated examples of what a national educational system permitted, rather than clear guides for emulation elsewhere. The liberal education ideal survived the decade, but few held out great hope for its early realization.[10]

The Great Depression marked a silent shift away from elite higher education based upon the liberal education model toward a notion of general education which explicitly tailored college programs for citizens and masses rather than elites. In the crisis, all institutions scrambled for funds and many for students in order to stave off collapse, though remarkably few admitted their difficulties in public. Advocacy of the timelessness of certain academic subjects and approaches gave way to calls that college courses squarely face social problems. The implicit individualism of the earlier liberal education approach had intended to enculturate potential leaders of society. New emphases on teaching individual students to cooperate with each other and to recognize social obligations replaced them, although

the formal curriculum recorded few systematic changes in response to new times. Survey and introductory courses, the backbone of general education offerings throughout the nation during the 1930s, flourished especially because of their relative inexpensiveness. As one committee of university deans put it in 1932, "apparently we are producing more lawyers, doctors, engineers, and teachers than are required [but] the market for intelligent citizens is limitless and their production costs to the state offer possibilities in the economy of time and public expenditure."[11]

The general education of the decade specifically called for the education of young Americans for "followership" as well as "leadership." This movement recognized that many college students faced problems of morale as well as of ability. High school graduates without job opportunities, they crowded into public universities aimlessly, multiplying the problems educators faced in the 1920s, and adding new ones. Responding in terms originally articulated by President Lotus D. Coffman of the University of Minnesota, general education redesigned the curriculum of the first two years of college around the perceived social needs of these average students. Paralleling the vast increase in high school enrollment and an attendant concentration on "life adjustment" secondary education for non-academic adolescents, this general education movement relied heavily on standardized intelligence testing, special courses on study skills, and the use of audio-visual materials rather than on the procedures of the traditional liberal arts college classroom. The "orientation" courses of the general education movement stressed student psychology rather than the focus on world issues or the integration of knowledge favored by the "initiatory courses" of the 1920s. They helped a student know who he was instead of trying to make him over. General Colleges flourished at Minnesota, where high school graduates with low

aptitude test scores were assigned involuntarily, at Florida State and at a number of other institutions. They paved the way for a redirection of lower-division college work in many less venturesome universities as well. With a nominal commitment to some liberal education traditions, the general education movement modified them to accommodate changed conditions and clienteles.[12]

The pervasive nationalism and the rise of popular culture that characterized the 1930s also influenced the general educators. Sensitive to charges of anti-intellectualism, some general education advocates recalled the old criticisms of the outcomes of liberal arts programs of the 1920s and added the charge of social elitism. Ironically, their biggest target was the University of Chicago, whose two-year lower division program and subsequent recommendation that the Bachelor's degree be given at the end of the sophomore year threatened the traditional liberal arts college more than most alternatives proposed by the general educators. Chicago also trained its students to engage in social, collaborative activities by emphasizing discussion courses rather than large lectures. It hardly stressed competitive, extra-curricular "leadership" achievement on the model of Stover at Yale. But the other-worldly focus on the Great Books of Robert M. Hutchins and Mortimer J. Adler sufficiently alarmed deans and faculty members faced with matriculants who could hardly pass freshman composition to spur sharp exchanges with defenders of the Chicago plan. Debates during the late 1930s assessed the place of the college in American life in terms of its commitment to democratic values as well as its ability to sustain scholarly excellence.[13]

The world crisis leading to the Second World War stimulated a revival of the humanities. Long a central element in the liberal education ideal,

the humanities had long endured criticism for their impracticality. Calls for a reaffirmation of Western humane traditions to combat totalitarianism coincided with advocacy of returning the humanities to the center of the college curriculum. As Lionel Trilling wrote in 1944, an "elaborate concern with education" arose from an "uneasiness not only about education itself but also about the whole of our society and culture, of which education is but the small, visible, extruded part." Academic professional organizations established task forces to study the plight of the traditional liberal disciplines, and their reports thundered successively during the war years. At the same time, federal government policy came close to declaring liberal education obsolete as bureaucrats skirmished with each other and with educators in search of a national policy for higher education during the war. The very financial assistance typified by the Army Special Training Programs and the Navy's V-12 curriculum, which enabled colleges to survive depletion of their student bodies by selective service, placed premiums on specialized skills and rapid certification thoroughly at odds with academic practice, both the newer general education approach and the liberal education ideal.[14]

Although educators eventually organized themselves, through the American Council on Education, into a reasonably effective national pressure group during World War II, it was external constituencies and events which influenced the triumph of the idea of mass higher education in the 1940s. The enactment of the G.I. Bill to provide educational benefits for returning servicemen was far more the work of the American Legion and influential congressmen than of college presidents or faculty members. Moreover, federal aid to higher education in the form of G.I. Bill benefits firmly decided in favor of equality of access to training against the more elitist notions of educators, including President James B. Conant of Harvard, who had lobbied

for more selective educational rewards for veterans. The major substantive contribution of the general education movement to the war effort was probably the American Council on Education's A Design for General Education for Members of the Armed Forces (1944), which reflected the Minnesota approach to general education more than the traditional liberal arts assumptions.[15]

The liberal arts ideal saw its most significant revival during the war years in the work of the Committee which produced the Harvard "Redbook," General Education in a Free Society, in 1945. The Harvard Committee's work attracted a good deal more attention than the reports and recommendations of the various other commissions and study groups, and tried to synthesize liberal education ideals with general education practices to reach a broad audience. It justified common learning as a means to national survival. The Committee declared that "the very idea of a common body of training and knowledge means that everyone, irrespective of his bent, owes a duty to his general sharing in the culture and to his membership in society." Like the efforts of general educators, the Harvard Report linked recommendations for higher education and secondary education. But its proposals for both high school and for Harvard College curricular reform favored intensive study in the traditional liberal arts disciplines and the traditional objectives embodied in the ideal of education for leadership. It thereby laid the groundwork for a new synthesis, the "university college," which combined intensive undergraduate education in the setting of a research university. That viewpoint made the liberal arts college primarily a preparation for graduate school rather than an end in itself. Observers divided over whether the report had successfully synthesized competing values and objectives.[16]

The final milestone in public proclamations about the locus of higher education in American life before midcentury was marked by the report

of President Harry S. Truman's Commission on Higher Education in 1947-1948. Higher Education for American Democracy emerged directly from the general education ideal of the 1930s. This presidential commission report made higher education a national right for large numbers of Americans rather than a privilege open only to a qualified few. As the Commission wrote, "general education is not sharply distinguished from liberal education . . . General education is liberal education . . . shifted from its original aristocratic intent to the service of democracy. General education seeks to extend to all men the benefits of an education that liberates." The President's Commission favored public financial support for as much education as a citizen could profit by, and urged federal programs to help needy students continue in school and college. It also supplied an ambitious forecast of future enrollment that many contemporary commentators deemed hopelessly unrealistic. Despite sharp criticism from educational traditionalists and political conservatives alike, the Commission Report remained the foundation for the educational establishments of the 1960s. Its forecasts seemed unduly cautious a generation later.[17]

By the middle 1950s higher education showed signs of growing beyond all bounds. Ironically, some educators abandoned their earlier enthusiasms. As David Riesman ruefully wrote in 1956, "most of them no longer see their work as an 'Operation Bootstrap' by which a whole society can be made over, and only a few repeat the early chiliastic claims for higher education." With the triumph of mass higher education, largely under the banner of a version of the liberal education ideal, a sea change evidently had occurred. Higher education now stood mainly as one among a number of large, lumbering national institutions, sustained by its interlocking relationships with other institutions rather than as an external generator which empowered the whole.

Liberal education had provided much of the rationale for developments motivated primarily by other forces: the ambitions of college presidents, the enthusiasms of parents ambitious to record their own success or ensure their childrens' futures, youth's pursuit of college for want of anything better to do, the wartime demands of the national government, the peacetime demands of industries and professions eager for filters to sort applicants for middle-level occupations in a segmented society.[18]

In each decade educators provided a series of core arguments which outside pressures modified. In the process, the educational system enlarged and transformed itself in directions far different from the enduring liberal education goals. Honors work and Rhodes Scholarships remained for the very few, but elements of the general education programs confronted practically every entering student by midcentury, with varying results. As higher education grew, the intensity that liberal education was supposed to sustain vanished. By the middle 1950s, entering freshmen each year no longer expected college to be a powerful, urgent experience. Many just planned on a continuation of secondary education, or as one college president put it, "high school with hotels." Critical reaction against these tendencies reflected a misleading nostalgia for times that never were, as the unfulfilled promises of the 1920s attested. The mystique of the value of education was constantly recorded in public opinion surveys in the years after 1945, but the content of that education, and even its essential purpose remained remarkably vague.[19]

## NOTES

[1]U. S. Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970, Bicentennial Edition, Part 1 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1975), 383.

[2]Burton R. Clark, The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed, Swarthmore (Chicago: Aldine Press, 1970), 4.

[3]A classic definition of liberal education is in Alexander Meiklejohn, The Liberal College (Boston: Marshall Jones, 1920). For a summary of a contrasting view of liberal education as personal development rather than academic achievement and participatory leadership, see "Appendix A: Goals of a Liberal Education," in Douglas H. Heath, Growing Up in College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968), 274-278. On history's place, see David B. Potts, "Is History an Essential Part of Programs for General Education? Answers Past and Present," Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, San Francisco, California, December 28, 1978.

[4]A highly critical analysis is Carol S. Gruber, Mars and Minerva: World War I and the Uses of the Higher Learning in America (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1975), especially chapters V-VI. Samuel P. Capen and Walton C. John, "A Survey of Higher Education," U. S. Bureau of Education, Biennial Survey of Education, 1916-1918, Volume I, give a favorable accounting of student and faculty enthusiasm and participation in what they "regarded as a great moral crusade." They quote Secretary of War Newton D. Baker's praise for college men as officer material. W. H. Cowley, later a college president and educational reformer, entered college after service in the World War I army because college men were officers, see "The Recollections of William Harold Cowley," Columbia University Oral History Collection (1962), 58. A. Lawrence Lowell, "The University--The Bulwark of Civilization," Harpers, 139 (November 1919), 867-868.

[5]Aydelotte describes "Honors Courses at Swarthmore," in Herbert E. Hawkes (ed.), Five College Plans (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931), and Leon B. Richardson praises them while making recommendations for Dartmouth in A Study of the Liberal College (Hanover, N.H.: n. p., 1924). Lowell's views are collected in At War With Academic Traditions in America (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1934). On the reputation of the Rhodes Scholarships, see for example, Robert Cooley Angell, The Campus (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1928), 47; O. B. Andrews, "Rhodes Scholars," American Mercury, 10 (February 1927), 226-235; Charles W. Thomas, "Oxford in American Education," Southwestern Review, 13 (1927-1928) 234-248; and Frank Aydelotte, The American Rhodes Scholarships: A Review of the First Forty Years (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1946). A description of "Initiatory Courses for Freshmen" is in the Bulletin of the Association of American University Professors (Henceforth, AAUP Bulletin), VIII (October 1922), 350-380; it covers programs at fourteen institutions.

[6]Thorstein Veblen, The Higher Learning in America (New York: B. W. Huebsch); Upton Sinclair, The Goose-Step (Pasadenia, Cal.: The Author, 1923); and J. E. Kirkpatrick, The American College and Its Rulers (New York: The New Republic, 1927) stand pretty much alone as full-scale assaults on governance in the 1920s, with the exception of some A. A. U. P. members who urged faculty control of the purse-strings as well as the curriculum. Meiklejohn defended liberal education for average as well as bright students in "Who Should Go to College?" The New Republic, 57 (January 16, 1929), 238-241, and in Alexander Meiklejohn, The Experimental College (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932), 68-69, 73.

[7]For contemporary examples of opinion, see Wilbur C. Abbott, "The Guild of Students," Atlantic Monthly, 128 (November 1921), 619-625. Academic novels, notably Percy Marks's The Plastic Age (New York: Century, 1924), popularized the stereotypes. Scholarly commentary includes Joseph F. Kett, Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the Present (New York: Basic Books, 1977), chapter 9; Paula S. Fass, The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920s (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977); Gilman Ostrander, American Civilization in the First Machine Age, 1890-1940 (New York: Harper and Row, 1970); and Mollie Camp Davis, "Quest for a New America: Ferment in Collegiate Culture, 1921-1929," Ph. D. dissertation, University of Georgia, 1972, who redresses the balance by pointing out evidence of social responsibility among many collegiate youth. Max McConn, College or Kindergarten? (New York: The New Republic, 1928) suggested segregating serious students from un-serious ones.

[8]Harold S. Wechsler, The Qualified Student: A History of Selective College Admission in America (New York: John Wiley, 1977) examines Columbia's anti-Semitism in detail and suggests the influence of its quota system on other institutions, while Marcia Graham Synnott, The Half-Opened Door; Discrimination and Admissions at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, 1900-1970 (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979) explores the institutional dynamics of each situation. David Riesman effectively analyzes the "meritocracy" at Harvard in the 1920s in Seymour Martin Lipset and David Riesman, Education and Politics at Harvard (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975).

[9]The most detailed treatment of a single institution's decision to build dormitories is in George W. Pierson's history of the Harkness Bequest which financed the Yale College system; Pierson, Yale: The University College, 1921-1937 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1955), 207-252. See also Lowell's persistent advocacy of dormitories in At War With Academic Traditions, 257, 278-279, and in his Harvard University President's Reports for 1920-1921, 8; 1922-1923, 18-19; 1928-1929, 12-13; Meiklejohn, The Experimental College, 215-217; and Barry Dean Karl, Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 156-175, on a controversy over proposed dormitories there. The student-personnel movement still awaits a historian.

[10]On experiments of the 1920s see Meiklejohn, The Experimental College; Clark, The Distinctive College, on Antioch; and Warren F. Kuehl, Hamilton Holt: Editor, Internationalist, Educator (Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida 1960).

[11]Malcolm M. Willey, Depression, Recovery and Higher Education (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937), a study sponsored by the A. A. U. P., analyzes the impact of economic hard times on faculties. The quotation about inexpensive citizenship education comes from "Minutes of the Committee of Seven, February 6, 1932," in Presidents Files, University of Minnesota Archives, Minneapolis, Minn.

[12]See Lotus D. Coffman, The State University--Its Work and Its Problems (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1934), for a philosophy of general education. See descriptions of several institutions in William S. Gray (ed.), General Education, Proceedings of the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, VI (Chicago, 1934); General Education, Thirty First Yearbook of of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago, 1932) and B. Lamar Johnson (ed.), What About Survey Courses?(New York: D. Appleton, 1937). Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961) chronicles the rise of "life adjustment education," and Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), contains a scathing critique of it. Cornelia T. Williams, These We Teach: A Study of General College Students (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1943) explains much about both the students and the educators in the Minnesota program.

[13]Robert M. Hutchins, The Higher Learning in America (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1936) announced the Chicago president's views on reforming higher education along intellectualistic lines. Mortimer J. Adler, Philosopher at Large: An Intellectual Autobiography (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1977) defends and explains the Great Books movement. Criticisms of Hutchins include John Dewey, "President Hutchins' Proposals to Remake Higher Education," Social Frontier, 3 (January 1937), 103-104; Harry D. Gideonse, The Higher Learning in a Democracy: A Reply to President Hutchins' Critique of the American University (New York, 1937); Henry W. Chase, "Hutchins' 'Higher Learning' Grounded," American Scholar, 6 (Spring 1939), 236-244; W. H. Cowley, The Inauguration of William Harold Cowley as the Eleventh President of Hamilton College, Saturday, October 29, 1938 (Clinton, N.Y., 1938) and R. Freeman Butts, The College Charts Its Course: Historical Conceptions and Current Proposals (New York: Arno Press, 1939), 299-300. A contemporary defense of Hutchins against his critics is in Alain Touraine, The Academic System in American Society (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), 78-79.

[14]Trilling's comment is in Mortimer J. Adler et al., On General And Liberal Education (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1944), 23. Among the reports and volumes in the liberal education revival are: American Council of Learned

Societies, Liberal Education Re-Examined: Its Role in a Democracy (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943); Norman Foerster (ed.), The Humanities After the War (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1944); Brand Blanshard et al., Philosophy in American Education: Its Tasks and Opportunities (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1945); Fred B. Millett, The Rebirth of Liberal Education (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1945); Robert M. Hutchins, Education for Freedom (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1942); Alexander Meiklejohn, Education Between Two Worlds (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942); Mark Van Doren, Liberal Education (New York: Henry Holt, 1943); and Jose Ortega y Gasset, Mission of the University (New York: W. W. Norton, 1944).

[15]William M. Tuttle, Jr., "Higher Education and the Federal Government," Teachers College Record, 71 (December 1969), 297-312, and Ibid., (February 1970), 485-489, traces the rise of the American Council on Education as the wartime spokesman of colleges and universities. The best studies of the origins of the G. I. Bill are Davis R. B. Ross, Preparing for Ulysses: Politics and Veterans During World War II (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), and Keith W. Olson, The G. I. Bill, the Veterans, and the Colleges (Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucky, 1974). Several leading educators participated on the committee that drafted American Council on Education, A Design for General Education for Members of the Armed Forces (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1944).

[16]Harvard Committee on General Education in a Free Society, General Education in a Free Society (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1945), 98. On the idea of the "university college," see Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution (New York: Anchor Books, 1968), 21-26. Reactions to the report included Jacques Barzun, "Harvard Takes Stock," Atlantic Monthly, 176 (October 1945), 52-56; W. H. Cowley, "The Harvard Report--A Review," Harvard Educational Review, 17 (January 1946), 58-69; Franklin Bobbitt, "Harvard Reaffirms the Academic Tradition," School Review, 54 (June 1946), 326-333; Sidney Hook, "Synthesis or Eclecticism?," Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 7 (December 1946), 226-239; and Kenneth S. Lynn, "Son of Gen Ed," Commentary, 66 (September 1978), 59-66.

[17]President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy, Volume I (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), 49. "College Expansion Opposed by Gannon," New York Times, February 10, 1948, 25; Seymour E. Harris, "The Future of Higher Education in the United States," Harvard Educational Review, 18 (Fall 1948), 183-208; Gordon Keith Chalmers, "The Social Role of Education," American Scholar, 18 (Winter 1948-1949), 41-47; Harold W. Dodds, "The Liberal Arts--A Challenge to Communism," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 35 (1949), 336-345; Robert M. Hutchins, "Education and Democracy," School and Society, 69 (June 18, 1949), 423-426.

[18]David Riesman, Constraint and Variety in American Education (New York: Anchor Books, 1958 [1956]), 29.

[19] Among various commentators comparing college students' expectation of college after 1950 with those of earlier eras are Peter G. Filene, Him/Her/Self: Sex Roles in Modern America (New York: Mentor Books, 1975), 186, and Rowland Berthoff, An Unsettled People: Social Order and Disorder in American History (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), 443, 468.